

LEBESGUE INEQUALITIES FOR THE GREEDY ALGORITHM IN GENERAL BASES

PABLO M. BERNÁ, ÓSCAR BLASCO, AND GUSTAVO GARRIGÓS

ABSTRACT. We present various estimates for the Lebesgue constants of the thresholding greedy algorithm, in the case of general bases in Banach spaces. We show the optimality of these estimates in some situations. Our results recover and slightly improve various estimates appearing earlier in the literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{X} be a Banach space (over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C}) and $\{\mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{e}_n^*\}_{n=1}^\infty$ a biorthogonal system such that $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{e}_n\}$ has dense span in \mathbb{X} and $0 < \kappa_1 \leq \|\mathbf{e}_n\|, \|\mathbf{e}_n^*\| \leq \kappa_2 < \infty$. Examples include (semi-normalized) Schauder bases \mathcal{B} , as well as more general structures (such as Markushevich bases [11]). As suggested in [24, 25], greedy algorithms can be considered in this generality, by formally associating with every $x \in \mathbb{X}$ the series $x \sim \sum_{n=1}^\infty e_n^*(x)e_n$. Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) = 0$, so one may speak of decreasing rearrangements of $\{\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)\}$.

We recall a few standard notions about greedy algorithms; see e.g. [21, 22] for a detailed presentation and background. We say that a finite set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a greedy set for $x \in \mathbb{X}$, denoted $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(x)$, if

$$\min_{n \in \Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \geq \max_{n \in \Gamma^c} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|,$$

and write $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(x, N)$ if in addition $|\Gamma| = N$. A *greedy operator of order N* is a mapping $G : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ such that

$$Gx = \sum_{n \in \Gamma_x} \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) \mathbf{e}_n, \quad \text{for some } \Gamma_x \in \mathcal{G}(x, N).$$

We write \mathcal{G}_N for the set of all greedy operators of order N , and $\mathcal{G} = \cup_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{G}_N$. Given $G, G' \in \mathcal{G}$ we shall write $G' < G$ whenever $G \in \mathcal{G}_N$ and $G' \in \mathcal{G}_M$ with $M < N$ and $\Gamma'_x \subset \Gamma_x$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A65, 41A46, 46B15.

Key words and phrases. thresholding greedy algorithm, quasi-greedy basis, conditional basis.

First author partially supported by GVA PROMETEOII/2013/013 and grant 19368/PI/14 below. Second author partially supported by grant MTM2014-53009-P (MINECO, Spain). Third author partially supported by grants MTM2013-40945-P, MTM2014-57838-C2-1-P (MINECO, Spain) and 19368/PI/14 (*Fundación Séneca*, Región de Murcia, Spain).

Likewise, for every *finite* set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ we consider the projection operator

$$P_A x = \sum_{n \in A} \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) \mathbf{e}_n,$$

and the “complement” projection $P_{A^c} = I - P_A$.

Greedy operators are frequently used for N -term approximation. As usual, we let $\Sigma_N = \{ \sum_A a_n \mathbf{e}_n : |A| \leq N, a_n \in \mathbb{K} \}$ and $\sigma_N(x) = \text{dist}(x, \Sigma_N)$. To quantify the efficiency of greedy approximation one defines, for each $N = 1, 2, \dots$, the smallest number \mathbf{L}_N such that

$$\|x - Gx\| \leq \mathbf{L}_N \sigma_N(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_N. \quad (1.1)$$

This is sometimes called a Lebesgue-type inequality for the greedy algorithm [22], and \mathbf{L}_N is its associated Lebesgue-type constant. Likewise, one may consider “expansional” N -term approximations and $\tilde{\sigma}_N(x) = \inf\{\|x - P_A x\| : |A| \leq N\}$, and define the smallest $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ such that

$$\|x - Gx\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \tilde{\sigma}_N(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X}, \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_N. \quad (1.2)$$

A celebrated result of Konyagin and Temlyakov [14] establishes that $\mathbf{L}_N = O(1)$ if and only if \mathcal{B} is unconditional and democratic. Explicit estimates for \mathbf{L}_N have been obtained in various contexts for greedy bases [25, 2, 5], quasi-greedy bases [23, 7, 9, 6, 1], and a few examples of non quasi-greedy bases [19, 20, 17]. The goal of this paper is to present these inequalities in a more general setting, and improve them as much as possible so that they actually become optimal in certain Banach spaces. This of course depends on the quantities used for the bounds, which we list next.

- Unconditionality constants:

$$k_N = \sup_{|A| \leq N} \|P_A\| \quad \text{and} \quad k_N^c = \sup_{|A| \leq N} \|I - P_A\|.$$

- Quasi-greedy constants¹:

$$g_N = \sup_{G \in \cup_{k \leq N} \mathcal{G}_k} \|G\| \quad \text{and} \quad g_N^c = \sup_{G \in \cup_{k \leq N} \mathcal{G}_k} \|I - G\|.$$

We shall also use

$$\hat{g}_N = \min\{g_N, g_N^c\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}_N = \sup_{G \in \cup_{k \leq N} \mathcal{G}_k, G' < G} \|G - G'\|.$$

¹We use the notation $\|G\| = \sup_{x \neq 0} \|Gx\|/\|x\|$, even if $G : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ is a non-linear map.

- Democracy (and superdemocracy) constants:

$$\mu_N = \sup_{|A|=|B| \leq N} \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_B\|} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_N = \sup_{\substack{|A|=|B| \leq N \\ \varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon}} \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|},$$

and their counterparts for disjoint sets given by

$$\mu_N^d = \sup_{\substack{|A|=|B| \leq N \\ A \cap B = \emptyset}} \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_B\|} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_N^d = \sup_{\substack{|A|=|B| \leq N \\ A \cap B = \emptyset \\ \varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon}} \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|}$$

- A-property constants:

$$\nu_N = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + x\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + x\|} : |A| = |B| \leq N, \varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon, |x|_\infty \leq 1, A \cup B \cup x \right\}.$$

We are using the standard notation

$$\mathbf{1}_A = \sum_{n \in A} \mathbf{e}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} = \sum_{n \in A} \varepsilon_n \mathbf{e}_n, \quad \text{if } \varepsilon = \{\varepsilon_n\}.$$

Here $\varepsilon = \{\varepsilon_n\} \in \Upsilon$ means that $|\varepsilon_n| = 1$ for all n (where ε_n could be real or complex). We also set $|x|_\infty = \sup_n |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|$ and $\text{supp } x = \{n : \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) \neq 0\}$, and we write $A \cup B \cup x$ to mean that A, B and $\text{supp } x$ are pairwise disjoint.

All these are natural constants in the greedy literature, and often it is not hard to compute them explicitly; see §5 below for some examples. Let us point out some elementary inequalities for the less frequent constants \tilde{g}_N and ν_N .

Remark 1.1. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$g_N \leq \tilde{g}_N \leq \min\{2\hat{g}_N, g_N g_N^c, k_N\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Indeed, $g_N \leq \tilde{g}_N \leq k_N$ is obvious by definition and $\tilde{g}_N \leq 2\hat{g}_N$ follows easily from the triangle inequality. Finally, for each $G \in \cup_{k \leq N} \mathcal{G}_k$ and $G' < G$ we can write $Gx - G'x = \sum_{n \in \Gamma_x \setminus \Gamma'_x} e_n^*(x) e_n$ with $\Gamma_x \setminus \Gamma'_x \in \cup_{k \leq N} \mathcal{G}(x - G'x, k)$; hence

$$\|Gx - G'x\| \leq g_N \|x - G'x\| \leq g_N g_N^c \|x\|.$$

Remark 1.2. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\max\{\tilde{\mu}_N^d, \mu_N\} \leq \nu_N \leq g_N^c + g_N \tilde{\mu}_N^d. \quad (1.4)$$

Indeed, the inequalities $\tilde{\mu}_N^d \leq \nu_N$ and $\mu_N \leq \nu_N$ follow selecting $x = 0$ and $x = \mathbf{1}_{A \cap B}$ respectively in the definition of ν_N . On the other hand, for each $|A| = |B| \leq N$, $\varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon$, $|x|_\infty \leq 1$, $A \cup B \cup x$ we have $\|x\| \leq g_N^c \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B} + x\|$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \tilde{\mu}_N^d \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B}\| \leq \tilde{\mu}_N^d g_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B} + x\|$. Hence the inequality $\nu_N \leq g_N^c + g_N \tilde{\mu}_N^d$ is easily obtained.

The above mentioned constants are also natural *lower* bounds for the Lebesgue inequalities.

Proposition 1.3. *For all $N \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbf{L}_N \geq \max \{k_N^c, \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \max \{g_N^c, \nu_N, \mu_N, \frac{1}{2\kappa}\tilde{\mu}_N\}, \quad (1.5)$$

with $\kappa = 1$ for real spaces, and $\kappa = 2$ for complex spaces.

We shall present two results concerning upper bounds.

Theorem 1.4. *For all $N \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq k_{2N}^c \nu_N \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g_N^c \nu_N. \quad (1.6)$$

Moreover, there exists $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ for which both equalities are attained.

Theorem 1.5. *For all $N \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq k_{2N}^c + \tilde{g}_N \tilde{\mu}_N \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g_N^c + \tilde{g}_N \tilde{\mu}_N. \quad (1.7)$$

Moreover, there exists $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ for which both equalities are attained.

We discuss a bit these theorems and their relation with earlier estimates in the literature. Theorem 1.4 is a variant of a result of Albiac and Ansorena [1], which for \mathcal{B} quasi-greedy and democratic showed that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g^c \nu, \quad \text{where} \quad g^c = \sup_{N \geq 1} g_N^c \quad \text{and} \quad \nu = \sup_{N \geq 1} \nu_N;$$

see [1, Proposition 2.1.ii]. In the unconditional case, they announced as well the bound $\mathbf{L}_N \leq k^c \nu$ with $k^c = \sup k_N^c$ (see [1, Remark 2.6]), which itself improves the earlier bound $\mathbf{L}_N \leq (k^c)^2 \nu$ by Dilworth et al [5, Theorem 2]. Our (modest) contribution here is the explicit dependence on N of the involved constants, together with a slightly shorter and more direct proof. As discussed in [1], the main interest of these estimates occurs when \mathcal{B} is an unconditional basis with $k_N^c \equiv 1$. Actually, (1.5), (1.6) and the trivial estimate

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq \mathbf{L}_N \leq k_N^c \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$$

(see [9, (1.7)]), give

Corollary 1.6. *If for some N we have $k_N^c = 1$, then*

$$\mathbf{L}_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N = \nu_N.$$

In particular, the optimality asserted in the last sentence of Theorem 1.4 is attained for any 1-suppression unconditional basis \mathcal{B} . We discuss other examples in §5 below.

Theorem 1.4, however, has some drawbacks, the first one being that in practice ν_N may be much harder to compute explicitly than the standard democracy constants μ_N and $\tilde{\mu}_N$. A second drawback comes from the multiplicative bound $k_{2N}^c \nu_N$, which

may be far from optimal when both k_N^c and ν_N grow to ∞ . This already occurs with simple examples of quasi-greedy bases.

Theorem 1.5 intends to cover some of these drawbacks, with an estimate which is asymptotically optimal at least for quasi-greedy bases. In fact, if we set

$$\mathbf{q} := \sup_N \hat{g}_N = \min \left\{ \sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \|G\|, \sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \|I - G\| \right\} \quad (1.8)$$

then we can show

Corollary 1.7. *If \mathcal{B} is a quasi-greedy bases and $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$\max\{k_N^c, \mu_N\} \leq \mathbf{L}_N \leq k_{2N}^c + 8\mathbf{q}^2 \mu_N \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\max\{g_N^c, \mu_N\} \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g_N^c + 8\mathbf{q}^2 \mu_N. \quad (1.10)$$

If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, the same holds with the last summand multiplied by 4.

The fact that $\mathbf{L}_N \approx k_N + \mu_N$ for quasi-greedy bases is already known [9]. Our contribution here is an improvement of the implicit constants in the second summand, compared to $O(\mathbf{q}^4)$ in [9], and $8\mathbf{q}^3$ in [6]. Similarly, for $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ the earlier estimates in [23, Theorem 2] only gave $8\mathbf{q}^4$ for the involved constants in the second summand.

Another application of Theorem 1.5 is to bases \mathcal{B} which are superdemocratic but not necessarily quasi-greedy (see e.g. [3, Example 4.8]). In this case we have asymptotically optimal bounds $\mathbf{L}_N \approx k_N$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \approx g_N$; see Example 5.5 below.

Finally, we should say that the estimates in (1.7), being multiplicative, suffer from a similar drawback as (1.6), namely they may be far from efficient when both $\tilde{\mu}_N$ and g_N grow fast to infinity. For such cases one always has the following trivial upper bounds

Theorem 1.8. *If $K = \sup_{m,n} \|\mathbf{e}_m\| \|\mathbf{e}_n^*\|$, then for all $N \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq 1 + 3KN \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_N \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq 1 + 2KN. \quad (1.11)$$

Moreover, there exists an example of $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ for which all the equalities hold.

The optimality for \mathbf{L}_N in Theorem 1.8 was first proved by Oswald [17]. We give a different and simpler example in §5 below.

2. SOME ELEMENTARY LEMMAS

2.1. Truncation operators. For each $\alpha > 0$, we define the α -truncation of $z \in \mathbb{C}$ by

$$T_\alpha(z) = \alpha \operatorname{sign}(z) \text{ if } |z| \geq \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad T_\alpha(z) = z \text{ if } |z| \leq \alpha.$$

We extend T_α to an operator in \mathbb{X} by

$$T_\alpha(x) = \sum_n T_\alpha(\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)) \mathbf{e}_n = \sum_{n \in \Lambda_\alpha} \alpha \frac{\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)}{|\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|} \mathbf{e}_n + \sum_{n \notin \Lambda_\alpha} \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) \mathbf{e}_n, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\Lambda_\alpha = \{n : |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}$. Since Λ_α is a finite set, the last summand can be expressed as $(I - P_{\Lambda_\alpha})x$, so the operator is well-defined for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$.

Lemma 2.1. *If $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\varepsilon = \{\operatorname{sign} \mathbf{e}_n^*(x)\}$, then*

$$\min_\Lambda |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon\Lambda}\| \leq \tilde{g}_N \|x\|, \quad \forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{G}(x, N). \quad (2.2)$$

PROOF: Set $\alpha = \min_\Lambda |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|$. Notice first that

$$T_\alpha x = \int_0^1 \left[\sum_n \chi_{[0, \frac{\alpha}{|\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|}]}(s) \mathbf{e}_n^*(x) \mathbf{e}_n \right] ds = \int_0^1 (I - P_{\Lambda_{\alpha,s}})x ds, \quad (2.3)$$

where we have set $\Lambda_{\alpha,s} = \{n : |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| > \frac{\alpha}{s}\}$ for each $s \in (0, 1]$.

Hence

$$\alpha \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon\Lambda} = T_\alpha x - P_{\Lambda^c} x = \int_0^1 (P_\Lambda x - P_{\Lambda_{\alpha,s}} x) ds.$$

Note that $\Lambda_{\alpha,s} \in \mathcal{G}(x, k_s)$ with $k_s = |\Lambda_{\alpha,s}|$ and $\Lambda_{\alpha,s} \subseteq \Lambda_\alpha \subset \Lambda$. Hence

$$\|P_\Lambda x - P_{\Lambda_{\alpha,s}} x\| \leq \tilde{g}_N \|x\|, \quad 0 < s \leq 1.$$

The result now follows. □

Remark 2.2. The inequality

$$\alpha \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon\Lambda}\| \leq 2 \min\{g_N, g_N^c\} \|x\|. \quad (2.4)$$

was also proved by an elementary Abel summation argument; see [4, Lemma 2.2].

The next lemma is a slight improvement over [3, Proposition 3.1].

Lemma 2.3. *For all $\alpha > 0$, $|A| < \infty$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$ we have*

$$\|T_\alpha x\| \leq g_{|\Lambda_\alpha|}^c \|x\|, \quad \|(I - T_\alpha)x\| \leq g_{|\Lambda_\alpha|} \|x\|, \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\|T_\alpha(I - P_A)x\| \leq k_{|A \cup \Lambda_\alpha|}^c \|x\|, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\Lambda_\alpha = \{n : |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| > \alpha\}$.

PROOF: The result follows Minkowsky's inequality and the formulae (2.3),

$$(I - T_\alpha)x = \int_0^1 P_{\Lambda_{\alpha,s}} x \, ds.$$

and

$$T_\alpha(I - P_A)x = \int_0^1 (I - P_{\Lambda_{\alpha,s}})(I - P_A)x \, ds, = \int_0^1 (I - P_{A \cup \Lambda_{\alpha,s}})x \, ds. \quad \square$$

Remark 2.4. Of course, together with (2.6) one has the trivial estimate

$$\|T_\alpha(I - P_A)x\| \leq g_{|\Lambda_\alpha|}^c k_{|A|}^c \|x\|. \quad (2.7)$$

Being multiplicative, (2.7) is typically worse than (2.6) (if say both k_N^c and g_N^c grow fast as $N \rightarrow \infty$). However in some cases it may be better (e.g. when $g_{|\Lambda_\alpha|}^c = 1$).

2.2. Convex extensions. We shall use an elementary convexity lemma. As usual, the convex envelop of a set S is defined by $\text{co } S = \{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j : x_j \in S, 0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Lemma 2.5. *For every finite $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\text{co} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} : \varepsilon \in \Upsilon \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{n \in A} z_n \mathbf{e}_n : |z_n| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

PROOF: We sketch the proof in the complex case, where it may be less obvious. The inclusion “ \subseteq ” is clear, since each $\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}$ belongs to the set R on the right hand side, and R is a convex set. To show “ \supseteq ” one proceeds by induction in $N = |A|$. It is clear for $N = 1$, so we show the case N from the case $N - 1$. We may assume that $A = \{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_N\}$. Pick any $z = \sum_{n=1}^N z_n \mathbf{e}_n \in R$, that is $|z_n| \leq 1$. Write $z_N = r e^{i\theta}$, and by the induction hypothesis

$$z' = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} z_n \mathbf{e}_n = \sum_{\varepsilon} \lambda_\varepsilon (\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_{N-1} \mathbf{e}_{N-1}),$$

for suitable numbers $0 \leq \lambda_\varepsilon \leq 1$ such that $\sum_{\varepsilon} \lambda_\varepsilon = 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{1+r}{2} [z' + e^{i\theta} \mathbf{e}_N] + \frac{1-r}{2} [z' - e^{i\theta} \mathbf{e}_N] \\ &= \sum_{\varepsilon, \pm} \frac{1 \pm r}{2} \lambda_\varepsilon (\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_{N-1} \mathbf{e}_{N-1} \pm e^{i\theta} \mathbf{e}_N), \end{aligned}$$

which belongs to the set on the left hand side. \square

The next lemma is a straightforward extension of the inequality defining ν_N .

Lemma 2.6. *Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\alpha \geq \max |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|$. Then*

$$\|x + z\| \leq \nu_N \|x + \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|, \quad \forall \eta \in \Upsilon$$

and for all B and z such that $|\text{supp } z| \leq |B| \leq N$, $B \cup x \cup z$ and $|z|_\infty \leq \alpha$.

PROOF: We may assume that $\alpha = 1$. By definition of ν_N , the result is true when $z = \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}$, for any $\varepsilon \in \Upsilon$ and any set A with $|A| = |B|$ and $A \cup B \cup x$. By convexity of the norm, it continues to be true for any $z \in \text{co} \{ \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} : \varepsilon \in \Upsilon \}$. Then the general case follows from Lemma 2.5. \square

In a similar fashion one shows

Lemma 2.7. *Let $z \in \mathbb{X}$ and $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\text{supp } z| \leq |B| \leq N$. Then*

$$\|z\| \leq \tilde{\mu}_N \max |\mathbf{e}_n^*(z)| \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|, \quad \forall \eta \in \Upsilon.$$

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

The general outline for proving estimates of \mathbf{L}_N and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ goes back to the work of Konyagin and Temlyakov [14], with the improvements coming from refinements in certain steps. In Theorem 1.4 we use the ideas developed by Albiac and Ansorena [1], slightly simplified according to our previous lemmas.

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(x, N)$, and call $\alpha = \min_{\Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|$. Pick any $z \in \Sigma_N$ and $A \supset \text{supp } z$ with $|A| = |\Gamma| = N$. Then we can write

$$x - P_{\Gamma}x = (I - P_{A \cup \Gamma})x + P_{A \setminus \Gamma}x =: X + Z. \quad (3.1)$$

Since $|X|_{\infty}, |Z|_{\infty} \leq \alpha$ and $|\text{supp } Z| \leq |A \setminus \Gamma| = |\Gamma \setminus A|$, we can apply Lemma 2.6 with $\eta = \{\text{sign } \mathbf{e}_n^*(x)\}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - P_{\Gamma}x\| &\leq \nu_N \|\alpha \mathbf{1}_{\eta(\Gamma \setminus A)} + P_{(A \cup \Gamma)^c}x\| \\ &= \nu_N \|T_{\alpha}[(I - P_A)x]\| = \nu_N \|T_{\alpha}[(I - P_A)(x - z)]\| \\ &\leq \nu_N k_{|A \cup \Gamma|}^c \|x - z\| \leq \nu_N k_{2N}^c \|x - z\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

using Lemma 2.3 in the second to last inequality. Thus, taking the infimum over all $z \in \Sigma_N$ we conclude that

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq \nu_N k_{2N}^c.$$

The estimate for $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ is similar: for any set A with $|A| = |\Gamma| = N$ we have

$$\|x - P_{\Gamma}x\| \leq \nu_N \|T_{\alpha}[(I - P_A)x]\| \leq \nu_N g_N^c \|x - P_Ax\|,$$

using again Lemma 2.3 (and $|\Lambda_{\alpha}| \leq |\Gamma| = N$). By a standard perturbation argument as in [1, Lemma 2.2], this inequality continues to hold for all $|A| \leq N$. This implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq \nu_N g_N^c$, and establishes the theorem. \square

Remark 3.1. Notice that we could use in (3.2) the estimate in Remark 2.4, leading to the slightly smaller bound

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq \min\{k_{2N}^c, k_N^c g_N^c\} \nu_N.$$

For instance, if $k_N^c = g_N^c = 1$ for some N , this implies $\mathbf{L}_N = \nu_N$ (as asserted in Corollary 1.6). In particular, one always has $\mathbf{L}_1 = \nu_1$ (at least for normalized systems $\|\mathbf{e}_n\| = \|\mathbf{e}_n^*\| = 1$).

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5. With the same notation as in (3.1), it is clear that

$$\|(I - P_{A \cup \Gamma})x\| = \|(I - P_{A \cup \Gamma})(x - z)\| \leq k_{2N}^c \|x - z\|. \quad (3.3)$$

So we only need to estimate the term $\|P_{A \setminus \Gamma}x\|$. We pick any set $\tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{G}(x - z, |A \setminus \Gamma|)$, and use the elementary observation

$$\max_{A \setminus \Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \leq \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x - z)|; \quad (3.4)$$

see e.g. [9, p. 453]. Then, Lemma 2.7 with $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \{\text{sign } \mathbf{e}_n^*(x - z)\}$, followed by (3.4) and Lemma 2.1 give

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{A \setminus \Gamma}x\| &\leq \tilde{\mu}_N \max_{A \setminus \Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \|\mathbf{1}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\tilde{\Gamma}}\| \\ &\leq \tilde{\mu}_N \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x - z)| \|\mathbf{1}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\tilde{\Gamma}}\| \\ &\leq \tilde{\mu}_N \tilde{g}_N \|x - z\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

So, adding up (3.3) and (3.5) and taking the infimum over all $z \in \Sigma_N$ one obtains

$$\|x - Gx\| \leq (k_{2N}^c + \tilde{\mu}_N \tilde{g}_N) \sigma_N(x),$$

as asserted in (1.7).

The estimate for $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ is again similar: given a set A with $|A| = |\Gamma| = N$, we can replace (3.3) by

$$\|(I - P_{A \cup \Gamma})x\| = \|(I - P_{\Gamma \setminus A})(I - P_A)x\| \leq g_N^c \|x - P_Ax\|, \quad (3.6)$$

since $\Gamma \setminus A \in \mathcal{G}(x - P_Ax)$. The second estimate in (3.5) is valid in this case setting $z = P_Ax$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma \setminus A$. Thus we conclude

$$\|x - G_Nx\| \leq (g_N^c + \tilde{\mu}_N \tilde{g}_N) \inf_{|A|=N} \|x - P_Ax\|,$$

and as before, this last quantity coincides with $\tilde{\sigma}_N(x)$ by [1, Lemma 2.2]. The optimality of the constants is a consequence of Example 5.2, that we discuss below. \square

Remark 3.2. In (3.3) one could replace k_{2N}^c by $g_N^c k_N^c$, arguing as in (3.6). Typically, the latter will be a worse constant, except in some special cases, such as if $k_N^c = 1$ for some N , in which case $\mathbf{L}_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq 1 + \tilde{\mu}_N$ (regardless of what k_{2N}^c could be).

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.8. The first estimate in (1.11) is implicit in the first papers in the topic (see e.g., [19, 20] or [17, (1.8)]). We sketch below the elementary proof, as it also gives the second estimate. With the notation in (3.1), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{A \setminus \Gamma} x\| &\leq \sum_{m \in A \setminus \Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_m^*(x)| \|\mathbf{e}_m\| \leq \sup_m \|\mathbf{e}_m\| \sum_{n \in \Gamma \setminus A} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{m,n} \|\mathbf{e}_m\| \|\mathbf{e}_n^*\| N \|x - z\|, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

since $\mathbf{e}_n^*(x) = \mathbf{e}_n^*(x - z)$ when $n \notin A$. Thus, using either (3.3) or (3.6) we see that

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq k_{2N}^c + K N \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g_N^c + K N. \quad (3.8)$$

Now (1.11) follows from (3.8) and the trivial upper bound

$$k_N \leq K_* N \implies g_N^c \leq k_N^c \leq 1 + K_* N, \quad (3.9)$$

with $K_* = \sup_{n \geq 1} \|\mathbf{e}_n\| \|\mathbf{e}_n^*\| \leq K$. The optimality of the constants is a consequence of Example 5.1, that we discuss below. \square

3.4. Proof of Corollary 1.7. We need an additional inequality to pass from $\tilde{\mu}_N$ to μ_N . Consider the new constant

$$\gamma_N = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B}\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|} : B \subset A, |A| \leq N, \varepsilon \in \Upsilon \right\}, \quad (3.10)$$

and observe that $\gamma_N \leq \hat{g}_N$. We also have the following

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\kappa = 1$ or 2 , if \mathbb{X} is real or complex, respectively. Then,*

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B}\| \leq 2\kappa \gamma_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta A}\|, \quad \forall B \subset A, |A| \leq N, \varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon. \quad (3.11)$$

PROOF: Observe that changing the basis $\{\mathbf{e}_n\}$ to $\{\eta_n \mathbf{e}_n\}$ does not modify the value of γ_N . So we may assume in (3.11) that $\eta \equiv 1$. We use the convexity argument in [6, Lemma 6.4]. First notice that (3.10) actually implies

$$\|x\| \leq \gamma_N \|\mathbf{1}_A\|, \quad \forall x \in S = \left\{ \sum_{A' \subset A} \theta_{A'} \mathbf{1}_{A'} : \sum_{A' \subset A} |\theta_{A'}| \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (3.12)$$

In the real case, splitting $B = B_+ \cup B_-$, with $B_{\pm} = \{n \in B : \varepsilon_n = \pm 1\}$, it is clear that $\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B} = \mathbf{1}_{B_+} - \mathbf{1}_{B_-} \in 2S$. In the complex case, a slightly longer argument as in [6, Lemma 6.4] gives that $\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon B} \in 4S$. So, in both cases we obtain (3.11). \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let κ be as in Lemma 3.3. Then,*

$$\tilde{\mu}_N \leq 4\kappa^2 \gamma_N \mu_N, \quad \forall N = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.13)$$

PROOF: Take $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $|A| = |B| \leq N$ and $\varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon$. We must show that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq 4\kappa^2 \gamma_N \mu_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|. \quad (3.14)$$

In the real case, split $A = A_1 \cup A_2$ with $A_j = \{n \in A : \varepsilon_n = (-1)^j\}$, and pick any partition $B = B_1 \cup B_2$ such that $|B_j| = |A_j|$, $j = 1, 2$. Then

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{A_1}\| + \|\mathbf{1}_{A_2}\| \leq \mu_N [\|\mathbf{1}_{B_1}\| + \|\mathbf{1}_{B_2}\|] \leq 4\gamma_N \mu_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|,$$

using Lemma 3.3 in the last step. In the complex case, arguing as in (3.12) from the previous lemma, we have $\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} \in 4S$. Now given $x = \sum_{A' \subset A} \theta_{A'} \mathbf{1}_{A'} \in S$, we pick for each A' a subset $B' \subset B$ such that $|A'| = |B'|$. Again, we have

$$\|x\| \leq \sum_{A' \subset A} |\theta_{A'}| \|\mathbf{1}_{A'}\| \leq \mu_N \sum_{A' \subset A} |\theta_{A'}| \|\mathbf{1}_{B'}\| \leq \mu_N 2\kappa \gamma_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|,$$

using Lemma 3.3 at the last step. This easily gives (3.14). \square

PROOF of Corollary 1.7: By Theorem 1.5 and Lemma 3.4, the last summand in (1.7) can now be controlled by

$$\hat{g}_N \min\{2, \check{g}_N\} \tilde{\mu}_N \leq 2\hat{g}_N 4\kappa^2 \gamma_N \mu_N \leq 8\kappa^2 \hat{g}_N^2 \mu_N.$$

This clearly implies (1.9) and (1.10). \square

Remark 3.5. Observe that we actually have the more general bounds

$$\mathbf{L}_N \leq k_{2N}^c + 8\kappa^2 \gamma_N \hat{g}_N \mu_N, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq g_N^c + 8\kappa^2 \gamma_N \hat{g}_N \mu_N. \quad (3.15)$$

We show in Example 5.5 below that this bound is asymptotically optimal for some non quasi-greedy bases.

4. LOWER BOUNDS: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.3

The lower bounds in (1.5) are quite elementary, and most of them have appeared before in the literature. We sketch the proof of those we did not find explicitly in this generality.

4.1. $\mathbf{L}_N \geq k_N^c$. This can be found in [9, Proposition 3.3].

4.2. $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \mu_N$. For any $|A| = |B| \leq N$, let

$$x = \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus B} + \mathbf{1}_{B \setminus A} + \mathbf{1}_{A \cap B} + \mathbf{1}_C,$$

where C is any set such that $A \cup B \cup C$ and $|A \setminus B| + |C| = N$. Then we can select $G_N \in \mathcal{G}_N$ such that $G_N x = \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus B} + \mathbf{1}_C$ and obtain

$$\|1_B\| = \|x - G_N x\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \tilde{\sigma}_N(x) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|x - P_{C \cup B \setminus A} x\| = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_A\|.$$

This clearly implies $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \mu_N$.

Remark 4.1. A similar construction can be used to show that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \tilde{\mu}_N^d = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|} : |A| = |B| \leq N, A \cap B = \emptyset, \varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon \right\}.$$

We do not know whether one may actually have $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ or even $\mathbf{L}_N \geq \tilde{\mu}_N$.

4.3. $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \frac{1}{2\kappa} \tilde{\mu}_N$. Given $|A| = |B| \leq N$ and $\varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon$, we must show that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\| \leq 2\kappa \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|.$$

It is enough to prove it for $\varepsilon \equiv 1$ (otherwise, apply the result to $\mathcal{B} = \{\varepsilon_n \mathbf{e}_n\}$). Recall from (3.12) (and [6, Lemma 6.4]) that $\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} \in 2\kappa S$, where

$$S = \left\{ \sum_{B' \subset B} \theta_{B'} \mathbf{1}_{B'} : \sum_{B' \subset B} |\theta_{B'}| \leq 1 \right\},$$

so it suffices to show that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{B'}\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_A\|, \quad \forall B' \subset B.$$

Pick any $C \subset (A \cup B)^c$ with $|A \setminus B'| + |C| = N$ and set

$$x = \mathbf{1}_{B' \setminus A} + \mathbf{1}_{B' \cap A} + \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus B'} + \mathbf{1}_C.$$

Then can take $G_N \in \mathcal{G}_N$ such that $G_N x = \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus B'} + \mathbf{1}_C$, and hence

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{B'}\| = \|x - G_N x\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \tilde{\sigma}_N(x) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|x - P_{C \cup (B' \setminus A)} x\| = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_A\|,$$

where we have used $|B' \setminus A| \leq |B \setminus A| = |A \setminus B| \leq |A \setminus B'| = N - |C|$.

4.4. $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq \nu_N$. Let $|A| = |B| \leq N$, $\varepsilon, \eta \in \Upsilon$, and $x \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $A \cup B \cup x$ and $|x|_\infty \leq 1$. We must show that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + x\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + x\|, \quad (4.1)$$

For every $j \geq 1$ we can find a set C_j with $|C_j| = N - |A|$, disjoint with $A \cup B$, and such that $\max_{n \in C_j} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \leq 1/j$. We set

$$y_j = \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + \mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + (I - P_{C_j})x + \mathbf{1}_{C_j},$$

and select $G_N \in \mathcal{G}_N$ such that $G_N(y_j) = \mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + \mathbf{1}_{C_j}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + (I - P_{C_j})x\| &= \|y_j - G_N(y_j)\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \tilde{\sigma}_N(y_j) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|(I - P_{A \cup C_j})y_j\| = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + (I - P_{C_j})x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_{C_j} x = 0$ we obtain (4.1).

4.5. $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \geq g_N^c$. We must show that for every $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}(x, k)$ with $k \leq N$, we have

$$\|x - P_\Gamma x\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|x\|. \quad (4.2)$$

Let $\alpha = \min_{n \in \Gamma} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)|$. Notice that for every $j \geq 1$ we can find a set $C_j \subset \Gamma^c$, with $|C_j| = N - k$, and $\max_{n \in C_j} |\mathbf{e}_n^*(x)| \leq \alpha/j$. Let

$$y_j = x - P_{C_j} x + \alpha \mathbf{1}_{C_j},$$

so that $\Gamma \cup C_j \in \mathcal{G}(y_j, N)$. Thus

$$\|y_j - P_{\Gamma \cup C_j} y_j\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \tilde{\sigma}_N(y_j) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|y_j - P_{C_j} y_j\|,$$

which is the same as

$$\|x - P_\Gamma x - P_{C_j} x\| \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \|x - P_{C_j} x\|.$$

Since $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_{C_j} x = 0$ (in \mathbb{X}) we obtain (4.2). \square

5. EXAMPLES

5.1. **The summing basis.** Let \mathbb{X} be the (real) Banach space of all sequences $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with

$$\|\mathbf{a}\| := \sup_{M \geq 1} \left| \sum_{n=1}^M a_n \right| < \infty. \quad (5.1)$$

The standard canonical basis $\{\mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{e}_n^*\}$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{e}_m\| \equiv 1$, $\|\mathbf{e}_1^*\| = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{e}_n^*\| = 2$ if $n \geq 2$ (so $K = 2$, with the notation in Theorem 1.8). The terminology comes from the fact that \mathbb{X} is isometrically isomorphic² to the span of the "summing system" $\{\mathbf{s}_n := \sum_{k \geq n} \mathbf{e}_k\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in ℓ^∞ ; see [15, p. 20].

Proposition 5.1. *For this example we have*

- $\mu_N = 1$ and $\tilde{\mu}_N = N$
- $g_N = k_N = 2N$ and $g_N^c = k_N^c = 1 + 2N$
- $\nu_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N = 1 + 4N$ and $\mathbf{L}_N = 1 + 6N$.

So, equalities hold everywhere in Theorem 1.8.

PROOF: It is clear that $\|\mathbf{1}_A\| = |A|$, so the basis is democratic and $\mu_N \equiv 1$. On the other hand, we trivially have

$$1 \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\epsilon A}\| \leq N, \quad \forall |A| = N, \epsilon \in \Upsilon.$$

The upper bound is attained if $\epsilon \equiv 1$, and the lower bound is attained in the explicit example $\|\sum_{n=1}^N (-1)^n \mathbf{e}_n\| = 1$. We conclude that $\tilde{\mu}_N = N$.

²Via the map $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{X} \mapsto T\mathbf{a} = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^\infty$, since $T\mathbf{e}_n = \mathbf{s}_n$.

We know from (3.9) that $g_N \leq k_N \leq 2N$. To see the equality, pick the vector $\mathbf{a} = (-1, 2, -2, \dots, 2, -2, 0, \dots)$, which has $\|\mathbf{a}\| = 1$. Then $\Gamma = \{n : a_n = 2\} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{a}, N)$ and

$$g_N \geq \|P_\Gamma \mathbf{a}\| = \|(0, 2, 0, \dots, 2, 0, 0, \dots)\| = 2N.$$

Similarly, $g_N^c \leq k_N^c \leq 1 + 2N$ by (3.9), and setting $\Gamma' = \{n : a_n = -2\} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{a}, N)$ we conclude

$$g_N^c \geq \|(I - P_{\Gamma'}) \mathbf{a}\| = \|(1, 2, 0, \dots, 2, 0, 0, \dots)\| = 1 + 2N.$$

Next we have $\nu_N \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq 1 + 4N$, by Proposition 1.3 and Theorem 1.8. For the lower bound we pick

$$x = (\overbrace{\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}}; \dots; \overbrace{\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}}; \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \dots) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{1}_B = (\overbrace{0, 1, 0}; \dots; \overbrace{0, 1, 0}; 0, \dots)$$

so that $\|x - \mathbf{1}_B\| = 1/2$, while $\|x + \mathbf{1}_A\| = \frac{1}{2} + 2N$ for any $|A| = N$. So,

$$\nu_N \geq \frac{\|x + \mathbf{1}_A\|}{\|x - \mathbf{1}_B\|} = 1 + 4N.$$

Finally, $\mathbf{L}_N \leq 1 + 6N$ by Theorem 1.8. To show equality, let

$$x = (\overbrace{\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2}}; \dots; \overbrace{\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2}}; \frac{1}{2}; \overbrace{-1, 1}, \dots, \overbrace{-1, 1}, 0, 0, \dots),$$

and pick $\Gamma = \{n : x_n = -1\} \in \mathcal{G}(x, N)$. Then

$$\|x - P_\Gamma x\| = 3N + \frac{1}{2},$$

while

$$\sigma_N(x) \leq \|x - 2(\overbrace{0, 1, 0}; \dots; \overbrace{0, 1, 0}; 0, 0, \dots)\| = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, $\mathbf{L}_N \geq \|x - P_\Gamma x\|/\sigma_N(x) \geq 6N + 1$. □

Remark 5.2. In this example one can also show that $\gamma_N = \lceil N/2 \rceil$ for the constant defined in (3.10). In particular, the bound in (3.11) (with $\kappa = 1$) cannot be improved.

5.2. Canonical basis in $\ell^1 \oplus c_0$. That is, we consider pairs of sequences $(x, y) \in \ell^1 \times c_0$, endowed with the norm $\|(x, y)\| = \|x\|_1 + \|y\|_\infty$. Write the canonical basis as $\mathcal{B} = \{(\mathbf{e}_m, 0), (0, \mathbf{f}_n)\}_{m,n=1}^\infty$.

Proposition 5.3. *The canonical basis in $\ell^1 \oplus c_0$ satisfies*

- $\mu_N = \tilde{\mu}_N = N$
- $g_N = k_N = g_N^c = k_N^c = 1$
- $\nu_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N = \mathbf{L}_N = 1 + \tilde{\mu}_N = 1 + N$.

So, equalities hold everywhere in Theorems 1.4 and 1.5.

PROOF: The second point is clear, since the canonical basis is 1-unconditional. For the first point just notice that

$$1 \leq \|\mathbf{1}_A\| = \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq |A|,$$

with the lower bound attained when $\mathbf{1}_A \in c_0$, and the upper bound when $\mathbf{1}_A \in \ell^1$. Finally, in view of Theorem 1.5 and the previous equalities, in the last point we only need to show that $\nu_N \geq N + 1$. Let $\mathbf{1}_A = \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}_n$, $\mathbf{1}_B = \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{f}_n$, and $x = \mathbf{f}_{N+1}$, then

$$\nu_N \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A + x\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_B + x\|} = N + 1. \quad \square$$

5.3. Canonical basis in $\ell^1 \oplus \ell^q$, $1 \leq q < \infty$. This variant of the previous example also admits explicit Lebesgue constants, but equality fails in (1.7).

Proposition 5.4. *The canonical basis in $\ell^1 \oplus \ell^q$, $1 \leq q < \infty$ satisfies*

- $\mu_N = \tilde{\mu}_N = N^{1/q'}$
- $g_N = k_N = g_N^c = k_N^c = 1$
- $\nu_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N = \mathbf{L}_N = (N + 1)^{1/q'}$.

PROOF: We only prove the last part, the other two being easy. By Corollary 1.6, we only need to estimate ν_N . From below, we choose as before $\mathbf{1}_A = \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}_n$, $\mathbf{1}_B = \sum_{n=2}^{N+1} \mathbf{f}_n$, and $x = \mathbf{f}_1$, so that

$$\nu_N \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A + \mathbf{f}_1\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_B + \mathbf{f}_1\|} = \frac{N + 1}{(N + 1)^{\frac{1}{q}}} = (N + 1)^{1/q'}.$$

From above, let $|A| = |B| = N$ and (x, y) have disjoint support with $A \cup B$. Then

$$\|(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \leq \|x\|_1 + \|y\|_q + N,$$

while if $k = |\text{supp } P_{\ell^1}(\mathbf{1}_B)|$, then

$$\|(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\| = \|x\|_1 + k + (\|y\|_q^q + N - k)^{\frac{1}{q}} \geq \|x\|_1 + (\|y\|_q^q + N)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

So,

$$\frac{\|(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|}{\|(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|} \leq \frac{\|x\|_1 + \|y\|_q + N}{\|x\|_1 + (\|y\|_q^q + N)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \leq \frac{\|y\|_q + N}{(\|y\|_q^q + N)^{\frac{1}{q}}},$$

and the latter is easily seen to be maximized at $\|y\|_q = 1$. So $\nu_N \leq (1 + N)^{\frac{1}{q'}}$, as asserted. \square

Remark 5.5. With similar (but slightly more tedious) computations one can show that, for $\ell^p + c_0$, $1 < p < \infty$, one has

$$\nu_N = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N = \mathbf{L}_N = 1 + N^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

while $\tilde{\mu}_N = \mu_N = 1 + (N - 1)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, so again equality fails in (1.7).

5.4. The trigonometric system. Consider $\mathcal{B} = \{e^{inx}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ in $L^p(\mathbb{T})$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. In this case, neither (1.6) nor (1.7) give good estimates, even asymptotically. By a more direct approach, Temlyakov [19] showed the following

$$c_p N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|} \leq \mathbf{L}_N \leq 1 + 3N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|},$$

for some $c_p > 0$. More precisely, the following inequalities hold (if $p > 1$)

$$c_p N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|} \leq \gamma_N \leq g_N^c \leq k_N^c \leq 1 + N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|}, \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$c_p N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|} \leq \mu_N \leq \tilde{\mu}_N = \tilde{\mu}_N^d \leq \nu_N \leq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \leq \mathbf{L}_N \leq 1 + 3N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|}. \quad (5.3)$$

So all the involved constants have the same order of magnitude $N^{|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}|}$. For the upper bounds in (5.2) and (5.3), see [19, Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.1]. The lower bounds are implicit in [19, Remark 2]; for instance if $1 < p \leq 2$ and $N \in 2\mathbb{N}$ then

$$\mu_{N+1} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\{1,2,\dots,2^N\}}\|_p}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\{-N/2,\dots,N/2\}}\|_p} \geq c_p \frac{\sqrt{N}}{N^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} = c_p N^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.4)$$

since the Dirichlet kernel has norm $\|D_{N/2}\|_p \approx N^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$. Likewise, by (3.11)

$$\gamma_{N+1} \geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon\{-N/2,\dots,N/2\}\}}\|_p}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\{-N/2,\dots,N/2\}}\|_p} \geq c'_p \frac{\sqrt{N}}{N^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} = c'_p N^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.5)$$

choosing in ε the signs of the corresponding Rudin-Shapiro polynomial. The case $p \geq 2$ is similar, replacing the roles of numerator and denominator.

When $p = 1$ the arguments in [19] still give

$$\mathbf{L}_N \approx \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \approx k_N \approx g_N \approx \sqrt{N}, \quad (5.6)$$

whereas

$$\gamma_N \approx \mu_N \approx \tilde{\mu}_N \approx \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\log N}. \quad (5.7)$$

In this last estimate the lower bound for each of the constants follows as in (5.4) and (5.5), using $\|D_{N/2}\|_1 \approx \log N$. The upper bound relies on $\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta_B}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta_B}\|_2 = |B|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and on the deeper result $\inf_{\varepsilon, |A|=N} \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|_1 \geq c \log N$, a famous problem posed by Littlewood and solved by Konyagin [13] and McGeehee-Pigno-Smith [16]. Finally, we show that in this case we have

$$\nu_N \approx \sqrt{N}. \quad (5.8)$$

Since $\nu_N \leq \mathbf{L}_N \lesssim \sqrt{N}$, we only need to show the lower bound. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we pick $B = \{-N, \dots, N\}$ and x so that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{-N,\dots,N\}} + x = V_N,$$

where V_N denotes the de la Vallée-Poussin kernel (as in [18, p. 114]). Then $|x|_\infty \leq 1$, $\text{supp } x \subset \{N < |k| < 2N\}$ and we have

$$\|\mathbf{1}_B + x\|_1 = \|V_N\|_1 \leq 3.$$

Next we pick $A = \{2^j : j_0 \leq j \leq j_0 + 2N\}$ where we choose $2^{j_0} \geq 4N$. Then $(I - V_{2N})(\mathbf{1}_A + x) = \mathbf{1}_A$, and therefore

$$c_1 \sqrt{N} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_A\|_1 \leq \|I - V_{2N}\|_1 \|\mathbf{1}_A + x\|_1 \leq 4 \|\mathbf{1}_A + x\|_1.$$

Overall we conclude that

$$\nu_{2N+1} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_A + x\|_1}{\|\mathbf{1}_B + x\|_1} \geq \frac{c_1}{12} \sqrt{N}.$$

5.5. A superdemocratic and not quasi-greedy basis. Theorem 1.5 becomes asymptotically optimal when $\tilde{\mu}_N \approx 1$, as in this case $\mathbf{L}_N \approx k_N$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \approx g_N$. We give a non-trivial example of this situation, which is a small variation of [3, Example 4.8]. This example has the additional interesting property of being *unconditional with constant coefficients*³ but not quasi-greedy.

Proposition 5.6. *For every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, there exists $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B})$ such that*

- $\nu_N \approx \tilde{\mu}_N \approx \gamma_N \approx 1$
- $g_N \approx k_N \approx (\log N)^{1/q'}$
- $\mathbf{L}_N \approx \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N \approx (\log N)^{1/q'}$

So, in this case Theorems 1.4, 1.5 and Remark 3.5 are asymptotically optimal.

PROOF: Let \mathcal{D}_k denote the set of all dyadic intervals $I \subset [0, 1]$ with length $|I| = 2^{-k}$, and $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{D}_k$. Consider the space \mathfrak{f}_1^q of all (real) sequences $\mathbf{a} = (a_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} = \left\| \left[\sum_I |a_I \chi_I^{(1)}|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\|_{L^1} < \infty,$$

where $\chi_I^{(1)} = |I|^{-1} \chi_I$. It is well known that $\{\mathbf{e}_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}}$, the canonical basis, is unconditional and democratic in \mathfrak{f}_1^q ; see e.g. [12, 8]. In particular, for some $c_q \geq 1$ we have

$$\frac{1}{c_q} |A| \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} \leq |A|, \quad \forall A \subset \mathcal{D}, \quad \varepsilon \in \Upsilon.$$

From the definition we also have

$$\left\| \sum_k b_k 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_k} \right\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} = \left(\sum_k |b_k|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

since $2^{-k} \sum_{\mathcal{D}_k} \chi_I^{(1)} = \chi_{[0,1]}$. For every $N \geq 1$ we shall pick a subset $\{k_1, \dots, k_N\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, and look at the finite dimensional space F_N consisting of sequences supported in

³That is, $\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| \approx \|\mathbf{1}_A\|$ for all finite A and all $\varepsilon \in \Upsilon$; see [24, Def 3].

$\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{D}_{k_j}$. We order the canonical basis by $\cup_{j=1}^N \{\mathbf{e}_I\}_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k_j}}$, so we may as well write their elements as $\mathbf{a} = (a_j)_{j=1}^{d_N}$. We also consider in F_N the James norm

$$\|(a_j)\|_{J_q} = \sup_{m_0=0 < m_1 < \dots} \left[\sum_{k \geq 0} \left| \sum_{m_k < j \leq m_{k+1}} a_j \right|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Note that $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{J_q} \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\ell^1}$, with equality iff all the a_j 's have the same sign⁴. In particular,

$$\|\mathbf{1}_A\|_{J_q} = |A|.$$

Now set in F_N a new norm

$$\|\mathbf{a}\| = \max \left\{ \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q}, \|\mathbf{a}\|_{J_q} \right\},$$

and observe that $1/c_q |A| \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\epsilon A}\| \leq |A|$, with c_q independent of N and k_j . Also, the vector $x = \sum_{j=1}^N (-1)^{j+1} 2^{-k_j} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{k_j}}$ has

$$\|x\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} = \|x\|_{J_q} = \|x\| = N^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

At this point we write $N = 2n$ and choose our k_j 's as

$$k_{2j+1} = j \quad \text{and} \quad k_{2j+2} = n + j, \quad j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

Then if $P = \sum_{j \text{ odd}} 2^{k_j} = 2^n - 1$ we have $G_P x = \sum_{j \text{ odd}} 2^{-k_j} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_{k_j}}$, which implies

$$\|G_P x\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} = n^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \|G_P x\|_{J_q} = n, \quad \text{and} \quad \|G_P x\| = n.$$

Therefore

$$g_{2^n} \geq \|G_P x\| / \|x\| \geq n^{1-\frac{1}{q}}.$$

We turn to estimate the unconditionality constant k_m of the space F_N . Given $|A| = m$, we first claim that

$$\|P_A x\|_{\ell^1} \leq c'_q (\log |A|)^{1/q'} \|x\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q}. \quad (5.9)$$

This is clear when $q = 1$ (since $\mathfrak{f}_1^1 = \ell^1$). When $q = \infty$, it is a consequence e.g. of [8, Remark 5.6] (since \mathfrak{f}_1^∞ is a 1-space, in the terminology of [8, (2.8)]). Thus one derives (5.9) by complex interpolation. From here

$$\|P_A x\| \leq \|P_A x\|_{\ell^1} \leq c'_q (\log |A|)^{1/q'} \|x\|,$$

which implies the bound $k_m \leq c'_q (\log m)^{1/q'}$.

Finally, we consider the space $\mathbb{X} = \oplus_{\ell^1} F_N$ with \mathcal{B} the consecutive union of the natural bases in F_N . Then

$$\frac{1}{c_q} |A| \leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\epsilon A}\| = \sum_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\epsilon A_N}\| \leq |A|,$$

⁴Note that $|a - b| < (a^q + b^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ if $a, b > 0$, so consecutive elements with different signs should be in different blocks of the James norm.

so \mathcal{B} is superdemocratic. We claim further that $\nu_N = O(1)$. Let $|A| = |B| = N$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}$ have disjoint support with $A \cup B$. Assuming first that $\|x\| \geq 2N$, we have

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + x\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + x\|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| + \|x\|}{\|x\| - \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|} \leq \frac{3/2\|x\|}{1/2\|x\|} = 3,$$

since $\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|, \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\| \leq N \leq \|x\|/2$. Otherwise we have $\|x\| \leq 2N$, which implies

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A} + x\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B} + x\|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\| + \|x\|}{\sum_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B_N} + x_N\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q}} \leq \frac{3N}{\sum_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B_N}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q}} \leq 3c_q,$$

since $\sum_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B_N}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q} \geq c_q \sum_N |B_N| = N$. Thus $\nu_N \lesssim 1$ as asserted. A similar argument shows that

$$\gamma_N \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon A}\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B}\|} \leq \frac{N}{\sum_N \|\mathbf{1}_{\eta B_N}\|_{\mathfrak{f}_1^q}} \leq c_q.$$

Finally, observe that $k_m^{\mathbb{X}} \leq \max_N k_m^{F_N} \leq c'_q (\log m)^{1/q'}$, while if $N = 2n$ we have

$$g_{2^n}^{\mathbb{X}} \geq g_{2^n}^{F_N} \geq n^{1/q'}.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.6. □

6. FURTHER QUESTIONS

As shown in Example 5.4, the multiplicative bounds in Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 are not so good when both g_N and $\tilde{\mu}_N$ go to infinity.

Q1: Find bounds for \mathbf{L}_N and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_N$ which depend **additively** on k_N , $\tilde{\mu}_N$ or ν_N . More precisely, determine in what cases it can be true that

$$\mathbf{L}_N \lesssim k_N + \nu_N \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{L}_N \lesssim k_N + \tilde{\mu}_N.$$

This is for instance the case for the trigonometric system, and the other examples in §5. In this respect, we can mention the results of Oswald [17], who obtains additive estimates of the form $\mathbf{L}_N \approx k_N + B_N$, but with constants B_N of a more complicated nature.

Related to the previous one can ask

Q2: Find examples such that k_N and ν_N grow independently to infinity.

Example 5.5 shows that one can have $\nu_N \approx 1$ and $\mathbf{L}_N \approx k_N \rightarrow \infty$. We do not know whether it is possible to have $\nu_N \approx N^\alpha$ and $k_N \approx N^\beta$ for arbitrary $0 < \alpha, \beta \leq 1$.

The new constant γ_N in (3.10) is a natural replacement for g_N in some situations. Example 5.5 (and also (5.7) in Example 5.4) show that this improvement may be strict and the ratio g_N/γ_N as large as $\log N$.

Q3: Find examples with $\gamma_N \approx 1$ and g_N as large as possible.

Acknowledgements: we wish to thank F. Albiac, J.L. Ansorena and E. Hernández for many useful conversations about these topics.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. ALBIAC AND J.L. ANSORENA, *Characterization of 1-almost greedy bases*. Preprint 2015.
- [2] F. ALBIAC AND P. WOJTASZCZYK, *Characterization of 1-greedy bases*. J. Approx. Theory 138 (2006), 65–86.
- [3] S.J. DILWORTH, N.J. KALTON, D. KUTZAROVA, *On the existence of almost greedy bases in Banach spaces*, Studia Math. 159 (2003), no. 1, 67–101.
- [4] S.J. DILWORTH, N.J. KALTON, D. KUTZAROVA, AND V.N. TEMLYAKOV, *The Thresholding Greedy Algorithm, Greedy Bases, and Duality*, Constr. Approx., 19, (2003), 575–597.
- [5] S.J. DILWORTH, D. KUTZAROVA, E. ODELL, TH. SCHLUMPRECHT AND A. ZSÁK, *Renorming spaces with greedy bases*. J. Approx. Theory 188 (2014), 3956.
- [6] S.J. DILWORTH, D. KUTZAROVA, T. OIKHBERG, *Lebesgue constants for the weak greedy algorithm*, Rev. Matem. Compl. 28 (2) (2015), 393–409.
- [7] S.J. DILWORTH, M. SOTO-BAJO, V.N. TEMLYAKOV, *Quasi-greedy bases and Lebesgue-type inequalities*. Studia Math **211** (2012), 41–69.
- [8] G. GARRIGÓS, E. HERNÁNDEZ, *Sharp Jackson and Bernstein Inequalities for n -term Approximation in Sequence spaces with Applications*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 53 (2004), 1739–1762.
- [9] G. GARRIGÓS, E. HERNÁNDEZ AND T. OIKHBERG, *Lebesgue-type inequalities for quasi-greedy bases*, Constr. Approx. 38 (3) (2013), 447–470.
- [10] G. GARRIGÓS AND P. WOJTASZCZYK, *Conditional Quasi-Greedy Bases in Hilbert and Banach Spaces*. Indiana Univ. Math. Jour. 63 (4) (2014), 1017–1036.
- [11] P. HAJEK, V. MONTESINOS SANTALUCÍA, J. VANDERWERFF, V. ZIZLER, *Biorthogonal systems in Banach spaces*. Springer-Verlag 2008.
- [12] C. HSIAO, B. JAWERTH, B.J. LUCIER, AND X.M. YU, *Near optimal compression of almost optimal wavelet expansions*, Wavelet: mathematics and applications, Stud. Adv. Math., CRC, Boca Raton, FL, (133): (1994), 425–446.
- [13] S.V. KONYAGIN, *On the Littlewood problem*. Izv. Akad. Nauk. USSR **45** (1981), 243–265.
- [14] S.V. KONYAGIN AND V.N. TEMLYAKOV, *A remark on greedy approximation in Banach spaces*, East. J. Approx. 5, (1999), 365–379.
- [15] J. LINDENSTRAUSS, L. TZAFRIRI, *Classical Banach spaces*, vol I, Springer-Verlag 1977.
- [16] O. C. MCGEEHEE, L. PIGNO, B. SMITH, *Hardy’s inequality and L^1 norm of exponential sums*. Annals Math. **113** (2) (1981), 613–618.
- [17] P. OSWALD, *Greedy algorithms and best m -term approximation with respect to biorthogonal systems*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 7 (2001), 325–341.

- [18] E. M. STEIN AND R. SHAKARCHI, *Fourier Analysis: an introduction*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [19] V. N. TEMLYAKOV, *Greedy algorithm and n - term trigonometric approximation*, Const.Approx., 14, (1998), 569–587.
- [20] V. N. TEMLYAKOV, *Nonlinear m -term approximation with regard to the multivariate Haar system*, East J. Approx., 4, (1998), 87–106.
- [21] V.N. TEMLYAKOV, *Greedy approximation* Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [22] V.N. TEMLYAKOV, *Sparse approximation with bases*. Ed. by S. Tikhonov. Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona. Birkhuser-Springer, 2015.
- [23] V. N. TEMLYAKOV, M. YANG, P. YE, *Lebesgue-type inequalities for greedy approximation with respect to quasi-greedy bases*, East J. Approx **17** (2011), 127–138.
- [24] P. WOJTASZCZYK, *Greedy Algorithm for General Biorthogonal Systems*, Journal of Approximation Theory, 107, (2000), 293–314.
- [25] P. WOJTASZCZYK, *Greedy type bases in Banach spaces*. Constructive theory of functions, 136–155, DARBA, Sofia, 2003.

PABLO M. BERNÁ, INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA Y APLICADA, UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE VALÈNCIA, 46022 VALENCIA, SPAIN

E-mail address: pmb11991@gmail.com

ÓSCAR BLASCO, DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE VALENCIA, CAMPUS DE BURJASSOT, 46100 VALENCIA, SPAIN

E-mail address: oscar.blasco@uv.es

GUSTAVO GARRIGÓS, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, 30100 MURCIA, SPAIN

E-mail address: gustavo.garrigos@um.es